

AHCCCS Provider Response to SAMHSA Fidelity Review

Complete the following form in response to the SAMHSA fidelity review process conducted by AHCCCS staff.

Date: 6/9/17

Name and contact information of provider:

Michael Franczak, Ph.D.
Michael.franczak@marccr.com

Type of evidence-based practice provider (select one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Permanent Supportive Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported Employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Operated Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assertive Community Treatment

What was your experience with the fidelity review conducted at your agency?

The reviewers were courteous.

What was most helpful about the fidelity review process for your agency?

Since we already have ongoing reviews by MMIC on these same issues, this review was more of the same. In addition, since many of the issues and recommendation focus on system issues, there is very little that a provider can accomplish alone. I think there should be some way to graduate from these reviews which are an administrative burden for the provider and an unnecessary expense to the system. The funds should be used to repair the systems issues that are repeatedly cited. Currently there is a severe shortage of affordable housing and this has a direct impact on the implementation of this evidenced-based practice and there appears to be no end in sight for this particular problem.

What suggestions would improve the review process?

We continue to believe that the reviews are actually not following the SAMHSA Evidence Based practice model or have interpreted some items in a way that we believe is inconsistent with the model such as maintaining copies of HQS Inspections and leases. We are a housing support provider and while we work with the housing provider, we do not think it is necessary to keep additional records that the housing providers already collect. While we do help individuals understand their lease we see no reason to keep a copy. We can access them from the landlord or person if the need arises. The reviewers should coordinate their reviews with the housing provider and not expect the support provider to have all of the information in their file.

Comments from your agency regarding the findings of the review and/or the fidelity report:

The review indicated that we only review ISP's annually when in fact we formally review them every six months or more often when necessary. In addition, the review indicated that we should have made changes to the ISP on a number of cases when significant events occurred but not give us any indication of what the significant events were that led them to that conclusion.

The review indicated that we should pursue technical assistance since we use a Critical Time Intervention (CTI) model for our services. We have been using the CTI model for the past 8 years originally based on a SAMHSA grant for Permanent Supported Housing. The SAMHSA staff indicated that the use of a CIT approach represented a national exemplary model. CIT is based on the premise that the goal of all services and supports is to build independence. CIT has a structure that is flexible based on the progress of the individual. While general timelines are suggested, the individual's progress towards independence guides the length of time the individual spends in

each phase. We do not graduate someone who needs assistance.

Overall the recommendations continue to suggest many issues that are system issues in nature. These items need to be addressed at a higher level than an individual provider. Since they continue to be cited, it implies that these issues are not being addressed at the system level. On many issues we have done all we can without the system changes.

